

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 8 and 14 have been editorially amended to improve clarity. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16 and 18-20 are pending in the application. The rejections are respectfully submitted to be obviated in view of the amendments and remarks presented herein.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) - Saito in view of Mosgrove and in further view of Lee**

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 13-15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Saito (U.S. Patent Number 6,275,889) in view of Mosgrove (U.S. Patent Number 6,928,503) and further in view of Lee (U.S. Patent Number 6,721,831). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, Applicants' invention relates to:

[a] data transmission system comprising:

a plurality of information transmitters connected to nodes on a bus, for transmitting/receiving data through a connection established between the nodes;

a connection establishing device for establishing a connection at each node;

a connection status information holding device for holding connection status information indicating a managing status of isochronous resources as bus resources while updating it during the execution of the connection establishment at each node, the managing status of the isochronous resources including an unknown status, a valid status, an invalid status, and a status of processing being executed;

a connection status information referring device for referring to the connection status information; and  
a processing executing device for executing predetermined processing to avoid unmanageable status of the isochronous resources when it is determined that the unknown status is out of a permissible range. (emphasis added)

Examiner maintains that Saito in view of Mosgrove and further in view of Lee teaches each feature of the claimed invention. However, as admitted by the Examiner in paragraph 4 of pages 3-4 of the Office Action, Saito fails to teach or suggest “a connection status information holding device for holding connection status information indicating a managing status of isochronous resources as bus resources while updating it during the execution of the connection establishment at each node; … a processing executing device for executing predetermined processing to avoid unmanageable status of the isochronous resources when it is determined that the managing status of the bus resources is out of a permissible range, wherein the managing status of the isochronous resources indicated by the connection status information includes, in addition to an unknown status, a valid status, an invalid status, and a status of processing being executed.”

In particular, the Examiner admits that “Saito and Mosgrove does not disclose a processing executing device for executing predetermined processing to avoid unmanageable status of the bus resources when it is determined that the managing status of the bus resources is out of a permissible range” (paragraph 4 on page 3 of the Office Action). The Examiner has relied on Lee for allegedly teaching “executing a predetermined process to avoid unmanageable

status of the bus resources when it is determined that the managing status of the bus resources is out of a permissible range” (paragraph 4 on pages 3-4 of the Office Action).

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Lee fails to remedy the deficiencies of Saito and Mosgrove. Lee merely discloses that if the channel (CH) and bandwidth (BW) are not available, *a redetermination is made whether a CH and BW is available after a predetermined time delay (416)* (FIG. 4A and column 4, lines 51-53). Therefore, in Lee, even if unknown status is out of a permissible range, it is determined that a CH and BW is not available. Then, Lee merely checks the status again after a predetermined time delay.

Lee does not execute any processing to avoid unmanageable status of the isochronous resources when it is determined that the unknown status is out of a permissible range. As a result, Lee cannot effectively set the bus resources by preventing the isochronous resources from being left unused, and therefore the bus is not reset to execute connection restoration if unknown status is out of a permissible range. Thus, Saito, Mosgrove and Lee, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest “a processing executing device for executing predetermined processing to avoid unmanageable status of the isochronous resources when it is determined that the unknown status is out of a permissible range,” as recited by claim 1.

At least by virtue of the aforementioned differences, the invention defined by Applicants’ claim 1 is patentable over Saito in view of Mosgrove and in further view of Lee. Applicants’ claims 8 and 14 are related method and apparatus claims respectively, and are allowable for analogous reasons as discussed above. Applicants’ claims {2 and 6}, {9 and 13} and {15 and 19} are dependent claims including all of the elements of independent claims 1, 8 and 14

respectively, which as established above, distinguished over Saito in view of Mosgrove and in further view of Lee. Therefore, claims 2, 6, 9, 13, 15 and 19 are distinguished over Saito in view of Mosgrove and in further view of Lee for at least the aforementioned reasons as well as for their additionally recited features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) –Saito in view of Mosgrove and in further view of Lee and in further view of Ishida et al.**

Claims 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 16, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Saito in view of Mosgrove and in further view of Lee and in further view of Ishida et al. (U.S. Patent Application Number 6,839,347; hereinafter “Ishida”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Saito in view of Mosgrove and in further view of Lee fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, “a processing executing device for executing predetermined processing to avoid unmanageable status of the isochronous resources when it is determined that the unknown status is out of a permissible range,” as recited by claim 1.

Ishida does not remedy the deficiencies of Saito in view of Mosgrove and in further view of Lee. Although the Examiner has relied on Ishida et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,839,347) for the teaching of connection status information comprising status designations, Ishida merely discloses error status information (HCE) which only indicates whether or not there was an error in a packet (column 16, lines 32-33). Therefore, Ishida fails to teach or suggest a processing executing device for executing predetermined processing to avoid unmanageable status of the

*isochronous resources when it is determined that the unknown status is out of a permissible range,* as recited by claim 1.

At least by virtue of the aforementioned differences, the invention defined by Applicants' claim 1 is patentable over Saito in view of Mosgrove and in further view of Lee in further view of Ishida. Applicants' claims 8 and 14 are related method and apparatus claims respectively, and are allowable for analogous reasons as discussed above. Applicants' claims {3, 5 and 7}, {10 and 12} and {16, 18 and 20} are dependent claims including all of the elements of independent claims 1, 8 and 14 respectively, which as established above, distinguished over Saito in view of Mosgrove and in further view of Lee in further view of Ishida. Therefore, claims 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 16, 18 and 20 are distinguished over Saito in view of Mosgrove and in further view of Lee in further view of Ishida for at least the aforementioned reasons as well as for their additionally recited features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)  
US Application No. 10/041,736  
Attorney Docket No. Q68034

Art Unit No. 2111

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Lenny R. Jiang  
Registration No. 52,432

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 19, 2006